

that if we meant to go no further there must be an end of the treaty, and Sarsfield added that he would lay his bones In those old walls rather than not take care of those who stuck by them all along, so the second article was explained to extend to *all such as are under their protection in the counties*, which I mention the more particularly because those words, though first agreed to, were omitted by mistake in transcribing that copy of the articles which was signed and the mistake not found out til! next day, when Mons. Ginckle's son was actually gone towards England with the original or a copy to be laid before their Majesties. This occasioned a great deal of trouble.[†]

It is certain that William III and his government did their utmost to carry out the terms of the treaty but were frustrated by the Parliaments of both England and Ireland. The English Parliament In 1691 passed an act to compel all members of the Irish Parliament to take an oath of supremacy and to subscribe to a declaration against transubstantiation. This exclusion of Catholics from Parliament in Dublin was contrary to the spirit, at least, of the treaty, which promised that they should enjoy such privileges In the exercise of their religion as they had possessed in the reign of Charles II. Furthermore, the Irish Parliament In 1695 passed a large number of acts against the Catholics and they two years later, when nominally confirming the articles of Limerick* limited their confirmation expressly

to so much
of them as consisted with the safety and
welfare of his
Majesty's subjects In Ireland. Mr. T. D.
Ingrain* in Two
Chapters of Irish History (1888), argues at
length that the
Irish Parliament was neither legally nor morally
bound to
ratify the treaty. On the other hand Mr. Robert
Dunlop
concludes : ^f Whether in doing as it did
Parliament acted
within Its constitutional rights or not, is a
moot point; but

¹ Leybome-Popham MSS., p. ^So.